

1739

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, which has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 4 through 6 have been amended for clarification purposes, and new claims 7 and 8 have been added.

The disclosure was objected to on the ground it lacked a CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS. However, this is a national phase PCT application filed under 35 USC 371, not a continuing application under 35 USC 111 based upon a previously-filed U.S. national application. Accordingly, a cross-reference to applications from which priority is claimed under 35 USC 120 is not relevant. Moreover, as provided in MPEP 201.11, referring to 37 CFR 1.76: "If the specific reference is only contained in the application data sheet, then the benefit claim information will be included on the front page of any patent or patent application publication, but will not be included in the first sentence of the specification." And because in this case an application data sheet was filed identifying both PCT/SE03/00386 and also SE 0201041-1, neither of those prior applications need be identified in a cross reference that must be included in the specification. Finally, also see 37 CFR 1.77 (b) (2), which relative to what should be included in the specification, provides: "Cross-reference to related applications (*unless included in the application data sheet*)." (emphasis added). Thus, the objection to the disclosure is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

The drawing was objected to on two grounds: first, that the mathematical relationship reflected by the equation that was included in original claim 2 was

1739

not shown, and, second, that "dimensions of the glow zone/union zone interface with respect to wall thickness" must be shown. With regard to the first ground of objection, the recitation in the specification of the relationship reflected by the equation is believed to be an adequate basis for the inclusion in a claim, because one of ordinary skill in the art, to whom the specification is, of course, directed, would be able to understand and to apply the relationship, which is a simple algebraic expression that a high school algebra student would understand and be able to apply by inserting into the equation suitable values for the several variables.

The same reasoning would apply to the second ground for objection to the drawing. Additionally, however, dimensions are not normally required in patent drawings. Indeed, it has been held that "patent drawings are not working drawings" *In re Chitayat*, 56 C.C.P.A. 1343, 408 F.2d 475, 478, 161 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 224, 226 (1969), quoting *In re Wilson*, 50 C.C.P.A. 827, 312 F.2d 449, 454, 136 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 188, 192 (1963). Thus, for the foregoing reasons, unless the examiner can cite specific authority for the drawing objections, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the drawing be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 4 through 6 were objected to on the basis of informalities. The requirement that in claim 2 "a transition region" be replaced by "the transition region" would appear to introduce an indefiniteness based upon a lack of antecedent basis, because there was not a previous recitation in either of claims 1 or 2 of a transition region inner surface. Therefore, that change has not been made. Claim 4 has been amended as suggested by the examiner, and claims 5

1739

and 6 have been amended to delete the term "respective." It is believed that as so amended, claims 4 through 6 are in proper form.

Claims 1, 5, and 6 were rejected as anticipated by the Heine et al. '724 reference, and claims 2 through 4 were rejected as obvious in view of that reference. In that regard, claim 1 has been amended to include the transition region inner surface relationship that was originally included in claim 2, and also to recite that the union is tubular throughout its length.

The Heine et al. reference neither shows nor suggests the invention as claimed in amended claim 1. Instead of a union that is tubular throughout its length, the Heine et al. reference shows in Figures 5 and 6 connector extensions 58 and 60 that each include an unnumbered, tapered blind bore. See Heine et al., col. 5, lines 44 through 48, in which it is specifically stated that extensions 58 and 60 "taper...to a solid shape at the end connected to the electrical terminals 66." Thus, the Heine et al. reference teaches away from the structure as it is claimed in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, because of the large solid portions at the outer ends of each of connector extensions 58, 60, the structure shown and described in the Heine et al. reference would result in a steeper temperature gradient between heating tube ends 54, 56 and the ends of connector extensions 58, 60 at the points of connection with electrical terminals 66. In the claimed structure, on the other hand, because of the tubular nature of the unions, which are without solid portions, the resulting temperature gradient along the unions would be less steep, and therefore the thermal stresses that would be induced as a result of

1739

temperature differences would be would smaller in the claimed invention than they would be in the Heine et al. structure. Thus, the invention as it is claimed in amended claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the Heine et al. reference.

Claims 3 through 6 each depend from claim 1, and therefore those dependent claims are also distinguishable over the teachings of the Heine et al. reference, for the same reasons as are given above in connection with amended claim 1. Moreover, each of those dependent claims contains additional recitations that further distinguish the invention as so claimed from the teachings of that reference.

New claims 7 and 8 each depend from amended claim 1, and each further recites structural features that are neither shown in nor suggested by the Heine et al. reference. That reference does not disclose tubular supply terminals, nor does it show or suggest a union in which a portion that is outward of the transition region has an inner radius that corresponds with a transition region minimum inner radius. Accordingly, new claims 7 and 8 are each patentably distinguishable over the Heine et al. reference.

Based upon the foregoing amendments and remarks, the claims as they now stand in the application are believed clearly to be in allowable form in that they patentably distinguish over the disclosure contained in the Heine et al. reference that was cited and relied upon by the examiner, whether that reference be considered in the context of 35 U.S.C. § 102 or of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Additionally, the examiner's objections to the specification and to the drawings are believed to

1739

have been overcome. Therefore, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested with a view toward the issuance of an early Notice of Allowance.

The examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if this amendment raises any questions, so that any such question can be quickly resolved in order that the present application can proceed toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



June 21, 2006

Alfred J. Mangels  
Reg. No. 22,605  
4729 Cornell Road  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45241  
Tel.: (513) 469-0470